

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 4, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-41 were previously pending in this application. This amendment presents amendments to claims 1, 11, and 32 proposed in a 116 Amendment filed August 3, 2007, which the Examiner indicated raise new issues in the Advisory Action of August 21, 2007.

Additionally, claims that depend from claim 1 have been amended, resulting in more limited dependent claims that clearly distinguish the cited references. For example, claim 2 is amended in a fashion that makes clear that the cited references do not relate to a "peer-to-peer collaboration system," as claimed. Claim 8, which depends from claim 2, similarly distinguishes over the references. Claim 7, which depends from claim 5, which in turn depends from claim 4 and claim 1, also recites a combination of features not shown or suggested in the references.

No new claims have been added. As a result, claims 1-41 are pending for examination with claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,204 and Parthesarathy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,353,926. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner cites Donohue as teaching apparatus for use in a peer-to-peer collaboration system that includes an activity program generating a component update request in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the reference. The cited passage in the reference at col. 7, lines 12-25 describes updating of software that is distributed on multiple computer systems and does not describe an activity program as claimed. Further, Donohue describes that updates are triggered by an updater agent and not in response to user actions within a collaboration system. Donohue even emphasizes that the updater component can operate automatically without requiring any interaction by the user after an initial agreement of update criteria (col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 2). Accordingly, Donohue does not teach or suggest "an activity program adapted to implement a portion of a collaboration session, the activity program maintaining a local data copy of a shared space in response to user actions within the collaboration system, and the activity program

generating a component update request in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session,” as claimed.

The Examiner does not assert that Parthesarathy teaches or suggests this limitation of the claim. Parthesarathy, like Donohue, describes periodic updates and does not describe an activity program “generating a component update request in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session.” Because neither reference teaches this limitation of claim 1, the references, even if properly combinable, do not render claim 1 obvious.

Independent claim 11 likewise recites limitations that are not shown or suggested in either of the references. As recited in claim 11, “a component update request” is generated “in response to receiving information about a component being used in a collaboration session involving the at least one other computer.” The claim further recites acts of “parsing the request,” “determining...availability of the component,” “selectively...using the URL information to asynchronously retrieve the file,” and “asynchronously installing the component from the file, whereby the computer system can use the component to maintain a second local copy of the shared space that is synchronized with the first local data copy.” Neither Donohue nor Parthesarathy teaches or suggests such a system in which receiving information about a component being used in a collaboration session results in generating a component update request so that local data copies of a shared space may be synchronized on different computer systems. Because neither reference teaches at least one limitation of claim 11, the references do not create a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 and 12-20 depend from either claim 1 or claim 11. The dependent claims distinguish the references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 or 11. The dependent claims recite limitations that further distinguish the references, providing additional reasons by the claims should be allowed.

The Examiner lists in ¶2 of the Office Action that claims 21, 31 and 32 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of Donohue and Parthesarathy. However, in the following paragraphs, the Examiner does not specifically cite any passages of the references that teach or suggest the limitations of claims 21, 31 and 32. For example, claim 21 recites a computer program product for use in a peer-to-peer collaboration system adapted to receive an update request generated as a result of user interaction with the peer-to-peer collaboration system. As recited in claim 21, the computer program product includes “program code that

extracts from the request information which identifies a location of a first file.” Other program code “extracts from the first file an indicia of a trusted supplier and obtains second location information of a second file.” Other program code extracts “from the second file the second component and an indicia of a supplier of a second component.” Other program code “selectively installs the second component when the indicia of the supplier is consistent with the indicia of a trusted supplier.” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness because no part of either reference teaches or suggests these limitations of claim 21.

The rejection of claim 31 should also be withdrawn for similar reasons. For example, claim 31 recites “program code that extracts from a first file dependency information identifying a second component upon which the first component is dependent.” Other program code “selectively downloads a second file when the dependency information indicates the second component is in the second file.” The Examiner points to no part of either reference teaching these limitations and the limitations are not shown or suggested in the references.

Claim 32 also recites limitations not shown or suggested in the reference. For example, claim 32 recites “means for implementing a collaboration session for a user, the means for implementing adapted to receive an indication of a component in use within the collaboration session involving the at least one other computer and to selectively generate an update request for the component.” Claim 32 further recites “means cooperating with the parsing means for a synchronously installing the component from the file, whereby the computer system can use the component to maintain a second local data copy of the shared space that is synchronized with the first local data copy.”

Claims 21, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Varma et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,334,141 and Parthesarathy et al, U.S. Patent No. U.S 6,353,926.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the Examiner has made a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 21. Though the Examiner asserts in ¶14 of the Office Action that Varma and Parthesarathy collectively describe all limitations of the claims, the Examiner points to no part of either reference that teaches or suggests “program code that extracts from the first file an indicia of a trusted supplier and obtains second location information of a second file, the second file obtaining a second component.” Accordingly, neither reference teaches or suggests other limitations of claim 21 relating to the second file, including “program code that selectively

installs the second component when the indicia of the supplier is consistent with the indicia of a trusted supplier.”

Similarly, the Examiner asserts in ¶14 of the Office Action that Varma and Parthesarathy collectively teach all limitations of claim 31. However, neither reference teaches or suggests limitations recited in claim 31, such as “program code that extracts from the first file dependency information identifying a second component on which the first component is dependent,” and “program code that selectively downloads a second file when the dependency information indicates the second component is in the second file.” Because neither reference teaches or suggests all limitations of claim 31, the rejection should be withdrawn.

As to claim 32, though the Examiner asserts that Varma describes a peer-to-peer collaboration system, the reference does not describe a peer-to-peer collaboration system meeting limitations of the claim. Claim 32 recites “a peer-to-peer collaboration system comprising a computer system and a memory and at least one other computer system maintaining a first local copy of a shared space.” The claim then recites “means for implementing a collaboration session for a user, the means for implementing adapted to receive an indication of a component in use within the collaboration session involving the at least one other computer and to selectively generate an update request for the component.” The claim further recites “means cooperating with the parsing means for asynchronously installing the component from the file, whereby the computer system can use the component to maintain a second local data copy of the shared space that is synchronized with the first local data copy.”

None of these limitations is met by either reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-30 and 33-41 depend from either claims 21 or 32 and distinguish the references for at least the reasons given in conjunction with those claims. The dependent claims recite limitations that further distinguish the references, providing additional reasons that the dependent claims should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: September 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Edmund J. Walsh/
Edmund J. Walsh
Registration No. 32,950
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000